

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/731,190	12/08/2003	Mohamad El-Batal	LSI.80US01 (03-1068)	4363	
24319 7590 08/05/2008 LSLCORPORATION			EXAMINER		
1621 BARBER LANE			KHANNA, MADHU		
MS: D-105 MILPITAS, C	A 95035		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
mina i i i i i i i			2151		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/05/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/731,190	EL-BATAL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MADHU KHANNA	2151		

	MADHU KHANNA	2151					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
periods:			-				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I:	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (a) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extern Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was compared to the compared to the notice of Appeal has been filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further contains the containing of the containin	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo							
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s).		•	· ·				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		i be entered and an e.	xpianation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t before or on the date of fling a bla	tion of Annualill not	be entered				
 The allidavit of other evidence field after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	/Salad Abdullahi/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2157					
	,						

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argument that the cited prior at does not teach "providing at least one spare device such that said at least one spare device plus said plurality of device devices results in a total number of system devices that exceeds said maximum number of network addresses" is not persuasive. Applicant acknowledges that Wang teaches a maximum number of network addresses. Nguyen teaches a plurality of devices which each utilize and address. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the number of active devices would correspond to the maximum number of available addresses in order for the system to be most efficient. Nguyen also teaches that the recovery spare devices are offline, and therefore not utilizing an additional network address, until an active device fails and the recovery device is the nought online to take over the same address as the failed device. Therefore the combination of Nguyen and Wang clearly teach a system capable of having a total number of active and spare devices which exceeds the maximum number of actives and spare devices which exceeds the maximum number of actives and spare devices which exceeds the maximum number of actives.